



# Town of Thetford Vermont

3910 Vermont Route 113 • P.O. Box 126 • Thetford Center, VT 05075  
802-785-2922 • Thetfordvt.gov

**Selectboard Meeting \*Draft\* Agenda**  
**Thetford Town Offices**  
**(w/Virtual Attendance Option)**  
Monday, April 20, 2026 7:00 PM

To connect to Zoom via computer: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88354391166>

To connect via phone only: +1 (646) 558 8656 | Meeting ID: 883 5439 1166

7:00 PM – Call to Order

1. Agenda review
2. Notes from the Selectboard Chair
3. Town Manager report
  - Green Up Day
4. Committee and commission reports
5. Public comment
6. Capacity Study results with Dubois & King, Inc. and the Capacity Study Steering Committee
7. Invasive plants and timing of roadside mowing
8. Updated version of the addendum to the Town purchasing policy regarding consideration of human rights
9. Warrants
10. Minutes
11. Adjourn

# Housing Capacity Study Comments and Questions

The Housing Capacity Study itself is available at:

<https://www.thetfordvt.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/6940/639088323674870000>

## Study Areas

- Corrections for "Study Area Selection Criteria Matrix 1 of 2" RE: Water. Under "East Thetford", "Available and reliable municipal water" should be "Available and reliable community public water." Similarly, Thetford Hill has "Available and reliable community public water".

## Parcel Selection

- I am concerned that you are encouraging growth in areas, e.g., Post Mills, that are far from jobs and far from the interstate, with the result being a lot more traffic and carbon emissions. Why not look more closely--or prioritize--the village centers that are closest to where people work? Several years ago, a proposal was made to investigate the town-owned land that currently houses town vehicles right near I90; why not look at that option more carefully??
- If the biggest problem is septic and water why are whole areas not eliminated and a sharp focus placed on a smaller areas where there is the best likelihood of solving the water septic issue?

## Parcel Ranking

- The Post Mills study area includes parcels abutting the landfill, in particular to the south and west (map p. 40), southwest being the direction in which the contaminant plume is believed to be moving.
- Maps on pages 45 & 46, "Environmental Constraints" A&B, identify 14 "selected parcels", 2 of which abut the LF. The map on page 51 shows 44 parcels where "further subdivision is possible", based on the zoning district and parcel size. Three of those parcels directly abut the landfill. Another four are across Rt 113 from the landfill in the zone where ground water was previously found to have been impacted or potentially impacted by contamination from the landfill.
- Build-out analysis maps, pages 51 and 53, use color coding and keys which appear contradictory and seem nearly impossible to reconcile with one another. Nonetheless, they appear to indicate substantial development potential in lots that abut the landfill. The report notes that each parcel "may contain one principal structure and one accessory dwelling unit (ADU)" and that the "principal structure may include one to five or more dwelling units, depending on site-specific constraints.

- The Post Mills focus level map (page 86 of the Capacity Study report) shows a 2.8 acre A-ranked parcel at 7386 Route 113. The parcel's attributes are described in an accompanying table as, "Flat lot with 135 ft road frontage, no physical encumbrances, abuts Post Mills Nature Area." The table indicates the potential for an additional 4 parcels at the site. However, the Vicinity Map on page 35 of the Phase II Environmental Site Assessment report for the landfill, which the study's authors apparently did not consult, shows that the parcel also abuts the landfill, which is clearly indicated as a "Hazardous Waste Site." The abutting parcel at 7366 Route 113 is B-ranked and given a potential for 7 new parcels.
- East Thetford there are options lots of options

## Methodology

- How is it possible that, with all the data collected and studies published regarding ground water contamination at and near the landfill and all of the discussion about it in town, there is no mention of any of it in the study's report? The word "landfill" doesn't even appear in the report. Nor do the words "contamination," "PFAS" or "forever chemicals."
- The Project Overview (page 3) notes 8 bulleted documents describing studies, inventories and plans that were referenced in the study. Missing from that set of relevant information are
  - Phase II Environmental Site Assessment Report for the former UVRLC Landfill, August 7, 2023 (ESA),  
[https://lists.vitalcommunities.org/lists/d\\_read/thetford/Upper%20Valley%20Regional%20Landfill/Phase%20II%20ESA%20Report\\_Fmr%20UVRLC%20Landfill.pdf](https://lists.vitalcommunities.org/lists/d_read/thetford/Upper%20Valley%20Regional%20Landfill/Phase%20II%20ESA%20Report_Fmr%20UVRLC%20Landfill.pdf)
  - Corrective Action Plan / Post-Closure Plan for the former UVRLC Landfill, May 7, 2025,  
[https://lists.vitalcommunities.org/lists/d\\_read/thetford/Upper%20Valley%20Regional%20Landfill/2025%20Corrective%20Action%20Plan%20-%20Post%20Closure%20Plan.pdf](https://lists.vitalcommunities.org/lists/d_read/thetford/Upper%20Valley%20Regional%20Landfill/2025%20Corrective%20Action%20Plan%20-%20Post%20Closure%20Plan.pdf)
- These unreferenced reports document contamination of the bedrock aquifer under the landfill with heavy metals, volatile organic compounds and, notably, PFAS compounds, also known as "forever chemicals". The concentration of PFAS compounds in samples from some monitoring wells have consistently exceeded Vermont's Ground Water Enforcement Standard. In some cases, levels far exceed the more stringent federal standards for PFAS.

## Mapping

- After those of the 5 villages, there are maps of 3 hamlets. Why are they included ? Do they play a role in the 3 villages selected for further study? It would be good if the final report includes more text explaining what they're in this document.

## Personal Property

- The map in the study for my properties are outdated so the property lines are incorrect; see the Thetford GIS system for the boundaries lines for the properties.
- Our business, Red Clover Cafe and Creamery, was not listed on the Matrix that showed businesses in East Thetford. I noticed other seasonal businesses were listed like Bike and Brew so seasonality did not seem to be a criteria.

## Other Comments

- For this study to be useful as a tool for thoughtful growth, there needs to be buy in. or sell out. Or it will be another costly survey to get dusty and unused in the vault. And why is Campbell Corner identified as a Hamlet, but not Ely?
- The Capacity Study report makes no mention of the water supply of Post Mills Water Association, which was built 26 years ago to provide safe drinking water to households downgradient of the landfill whose domestic supplies had been contaminated. That system is at its limit and cannot serve additional residences.
- Chapter 7 of the Capacity Study report covers “Next Steps for Thetford”, including recommendations for infrastructure and changes to the zoning bylaw to allow for denser development in the villages. The “Water and Wastewater Infrastructure” paragraph makes no mention of the need for a safe community water system to accommodate that growth in the Post Mills neighborhood near the landfill. There should be a recommendation to that effect.
- Thanks to Cynthia Shelton's listserv post on 4/2/2026, I became aware of and looked into the Capacity Study. I am not an affected property owner, nor do I reside in any of the 3 selected areas. However, I am interested in the next, in-actuality steps of this study and how they may impact the Town at large. What would implementing this study look like? Are property owners going to be given a choice? Housing is a crisis, and can our town's current services support an influx of residents which would come from further development? If development is made, how can the Town guarantee it'll be utilized? What would costs of said developments be - to current town residents AND future residents. Much of the housing crisis can be related to unrealistic housing costs - adding more availability at the same inflated costs doesn't seem like an appropriate answer, all the while, what could be viewed as "taking away" from current property owners who have been supporting the town and state with rising taxes. Would adding additional development(s) and residents help or harm that dynamic?

To: Thetford Town Manager, Thetford Selectboard  
From: Stuart Blood  
Date 23 March 2026

Subject: **Comments on Capacity for Growth Study report of 16 February 2026**

My comments are limited to the Post Mills study area and in particular to the failure of the study to consider how groundwater contaminated by the closed landfill in the village will constrain future development there unless a safe water system is developed for the neighborhood.

### **Lack of Rigor in the Methodology**

How is it possible that, with all the data collected and studies published regarding ground water contamination at and near the landfill and all of the discussion about it in town, there is no mention of any of it in the study's report? The word "landfill" doesn't even appear in the report. Nor do the words "contamination," "PFAS" or "forever chemicals."

The Project Overview (page 3) notes 8 bulleted documents describing studies, inventories and plans that were referenced in the study. Missing from that set of relevant information are

- Phase II Environmental Site Assessment Report for the former UVRLC Landfill, August 7, 2023 (ESA),  
[https://lists.vitalcommunities.org/lists/d\\_read/thetford/Upper%20Valley%20Regional%20Landfill/Phase%20II%20ESA%20Report\\_Fmr%20UVRLC%20Landfill.pdf](https://lists.vitalcommunities.org/lists/d_read/thetford/Upper%20Valley%20Regional%20Landfill/Phase%20II%20ESA%20Report_Fmr%20UVRLC%20Landfill.pdf)
- Corrective Action Plan / Post-Closure Plan for the former UVRLC Landfill, May 7, 2025,  
[https://lists.vitalcommunities.org/lists/d\\_read/thetford/Upper%20Valley%20Regional%20Landfill/2025%20Corrective%20Action%20Plan%20-%20Post%20Closure%20Plan.pdf](https://lists.vitalcommunities.org/lists/d_read/thetford/Upper%20Valley%20Regional%20Landfill/2025%20Corrective%20Action%20Plan%20-%20Post%20Closure%20Plan.pdf)

These unreferenced reports document contamination of the bedrock aquifer under the landfill with heavy metals, volatile organic compounds and, notably, PFAS compounds, also known as "forever chemicals". The concentration of PFAS compounds in samples from some monitoring wells have consistently exceeded Vermont's Ground Water Enforcement Standard. In some cases, levels far exceed the more stringent federal standards for PFAS.

### **Missing information results in poor conclusions**

The Post Mills study area includes parcels abutting the landfill, in particular to the south and west (map p. 40), southwest being the direction in which the contaminant plume is believed to be moving.

Maps on pages 45 & 46, "Environmental Constraints" A&B, identify 14 "selected parcels", 2 of which abut the LF. The map on page 51 shows 44 parcels where "further subdivision is possible", based on the zoning district and parcel size. Three of those parcels directly abut the

landfill. Another four are across Rt 113 from the landfill in the zone where ground water was previously found to have been impacted or potentially impacted by contamination from the landfill.

Build-out analysis maps, pages 51 and 53, use color coding and keys which appear contradictory and seem nearly impossible to reconcile with one another. Nonetheless, they appear to indicate substantial development potential in lots that abut the landfill. The report notes that each parcel “may contain one principal structure and one accessory dwelling unit (ADU)” and that the “principal structure may include one to five or more dwelling units, depending on site-specific constraints.

The Post Mills focus level map (page 86 of the Capacity Study report) shows a 2.8 acre A-ranked parcel at 7386 Route 113. The parcel’s attributes are described in an accompanying table as, “Flat lot with 135 ft road frontage, no physical encumbrances, abuts Post Mills Nature Area.” The table indicates the potential for ***an additional 4 parcels at the site***. However, the Vicinity Map on page 35 of the Phase II Environmental Site Assessment report for the landfill, which the study’s authors apparently did not consult, shows that the parcel also abuts the landfill, which is clearly indicated as a “Hazardous Waste Site.” The abutting parcel at 7366 Route 113 is B-ranked and given a potential for ***7 new parcels***.

### **A missing recommendation**

The Capacity Study report makes no mention of the water supply of Post Mills Water Association, which was built 26 years ago to provide safe drinking water to households downgradient of the landfill whose domestic supplies had been contaminated. That system is at its limit and cannot serve additional residences.

Chapter 7 of the Capacity Study report covers “Next Steps for Thetford”, including recommendations for infrastructure and changes to the zoning bylaw to allow for denser development in the villages. The “Water and Wastewater Infrastructure” paragraph makes no mention of the need for a safe community water system to accommodate that growth in the Post Mills neighborhood near the landfill. There should be a recommendation to that effect.



---

**Fw: Comments on Thetford Capacity Study for Growth**

---

**From** Sharon Harkay <sharkay@thetfordvt.gov>  
**Date** Mon 4/6/2026 11:53 AM  
**To** Town Manager <townmanager@thetfordvt.gov>

[Report This Email](#)

---

**From:** Kathy Helms <[khelms833@gmail.com](mailto:khelms833@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 6, 2026 9:25 AM  
**To:** Thetford Selectboard <[selectboard@thetfordvt.gov](mailto:selectboard@thetfordvt.gov)>  
**Subject:** Comments on Thetford Capacity Study for Growth

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [khelms833@gmail.com](mailto:khelms833@gmail.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Thetford Selectboard:

Re: Comments on Thetford Capacity Study for Growth

The Helms family has roots on Academy Road in Thetford Hill dating back to the 1920s when our great-grandparents came to Thetford. Our family has owned our current property at 125 Academy Road since 1939. We are pleased that the Selectboard has declined at this time to adopt Act 181's Tier 1B areas that would deregulate growth in village core centers. However, after reviewing the Capacity for Growth Study, we would like to provide our comments regarding some of the Capacity Study's recommendations.

The study applies a methodology for identifying the potential capacity for building new housing units within the study areas. We disagree with the report's recommendation to modify the Town's current zoning bylaws to adopt/permit the higher density residential and multifamily developments within the study areas identified in the report. We also disagree with the recommendation to modify the zoning ordinance to permit minimum lot sizes less than the current minimum of 20,000 square feet.

Currently, property owners wishing to subdivide their land must go through an application and hearing process. Also, developments proposing lot areas less than 20,000 Sq. Ft. or multifamily structures are reviewed through the Planned Unit Development (PUD) provisions. These provisions are to ensure that proposed subdivisions and developments are thoroughly reviewed for compliance with community standards, environmental impacts, and to adequately identify impacts to nearby property owners. The hearing process allows affected property owners and town staff an adequate opportunity to voice concerns and the subdivider/developer an opportunity to mitigate concerns.

Each individual property, proposed development and surrounding properties have unique circumstances that require an in-depth assessment of the impacts to the Town and nearby properties. The Capacity Study does not provide an adequate level of detail. The PUD requirement for proposed multi-family development is a safeguard that is in place for this reason.

The Town through its existing zoning ordinance recognizes that the Thetford Villages, while they are a collection of residential properties, are essentially rural in nature, with most properties several acres in size. This is particularly true of Thetford Hill, which is designated as a Historic District and an area with high scenic values and views across the Connecticut River Valley. Any high-density/multifamily proposal in this area should be looked at carefully by the community before being granted approvals so that cherished community values are not compromised and nearby property owners are not unduly impacted.

This study, while providing a useful planning tool, falls short of providing an adequate level of analysis of the impacts of higher density development on the parcels singled out within the study areas. These impacts include: water availability and wastewater treatment, traffic impacts, drainage, noise, and view impairment, environmentally sensitive areas, etc.

### Study Area 3 – Thetford Hill South Comments

The study suggests that over 30 new parcels could be created on the property owned by Thetford Academy, and the adjacent privately owned property. Existing traffic on Academy Road at peak times when school is in session is already beyond capacity and creates large backups on Academy Road and Rt. 113. The addition of an additional 30 units or perhaps much more if multifamily units were allowed on new subdivided parcels would create massive traffic problems at this intersection.

**Water Availability:** Currently, the Thetford Hill Water Coop water system is at or very near its capacity to service its existing members. The Coop, in recent years, has at times experienced water shortages and the need for Coop members to significantly curtail water use. The ability of this system to service new units is extremely limited and evaluated on a case-by-case basis. The large number of new housing units suggested in the study would require a large new water system to be developed to service it.

Thank you for hearing our concerns regarding the recommendations of the study, and our support for maintaining current zoning and policies in order to maintain the wonderful quality of life we all value in Thetford. In addition, thank you for the job you do as a Selectboard member on behalf of the citizens of Thetford.

Respectfully,

Kathleen Helms  
Keith Larson (Kathleen's husband)  
Robert Helms

# BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

## Roadside Mowing for Invasive Species Management

Town of Thetford, Vermont

Prepared April 2026

---

### Purpose

This document provides guidance to Town of Thetford road crews and contracted mowing operators on mowing timing and priorities to reduce the spread of invasive plant species along town road rights-of-way. Thetford's road network spans from the Connecticut River valley (approximately 400–500 ft elevation) to upland areas in the western part of town (approximately 1,200–1,600 ft). Spring phenology in the uplands typically runs 1–2 weeks behind the valley, and this document provides adjusted timing for both zones.

Poorly timed mowing is one of the primary vectors for spreading invasive plant seeds along roadsides. Mowing equipment picks up and distributes seeds efficiently. The goal of this BMP is not eradication—that requires sustained, multi-year integrated management—but rather to avoid making the problem worse and to reduce seed dispersal from existing infestations.

### Key Principles

- **Mow before seed set.** The single most important principle. Once seeds are viable, mowing spreads them. If you cannot mow a section before seed set, it is better to delay mowing that section until late fall or the following spring.
- **Clean equipment between sites.** Mowing equipment should be inspected and cleaned of plant debris when moving between road sections, especially when leaving an area with known infestations.
- **Do not mow knotweed.** Japanese knotweed spreads by stem and rhizome fragments, not seed. Mowing creates fragments that root at the nodes and establish new colonies. Known knotweed patches should be flagged and avoided entirely.
- **Prioritize by seed timing.** Schedule mowing routes to hit the earliest-seeding species first. Wild chervil and wild parsnip set seed earliest and should drive the initial mowing schedule.
- **Respect the elevation gradient.** Valley roads (Route 113 corridor, East Thetford, the east side of town near the Interstate) will have earlier seed set than upland roads (Tucker Hill, Barker and Sawnee Bean Road, etc and west Thetford). Plan routes accordingly.

### Mowing Priority Schedule

The following table organizes target species by mowing urgency. Dates are approximate and should be adjusted based on field observation in any given year. When in doubt, check whether seeds are present before mowing.

Priority	Species	Mow By (Valley)	Mow By (Upland)	Key Consideration
<b>CRITICAL</b>	<b>Wild Chervil</b>	<b>Late May</b>	<b>Early–Mid June</b>	Blooms May–June; seeds ripen June–July. Mow before flowers open.
<b>CRITICAL</b>	<b>Wild Parsnip</b>	<b>Mid–Late June</b>	<b>Late June–Early July</b>	Blooms June–July; seed set mid-July. PPE required—phytophotoder matitis risk.
<b>HIGH</b>	<b>Glossy Buckthorn</b>	<b>Before July</b>	<b>Before mid-July</b>	Fruit ripens July–Aug. Bird-dispersed. Mowing suppresses seedlings; cut-stump preferred for established plants.
<b>HIGH</b>	<b>Common Buckthorn</b>	<b>Before Aug</b>	<b>Before late Aug</b>	Fruit ripens Aug–Sept. Bird-dispersed. Seeds viable in soil 5+ years.
<b>MODERATE</b>	<b>Bush Honeysuckle</b>	<b>Before Sept</b>	<b>Before Sept</b>	Fruit ripens Sept–Oct. Bird-dispersed. Mowing useful for seedlings; mature shrubs need cut-stump treatment.
<b>MODERATE</b>	<b>Burning Bush</b>	<b>Before Sept</b>	<b>Before Oct</b>	Fruit ripens Sept–Oct. Bird-dispersed. Slow-growing. Pull seedlings; cut-stump larger plants.
<b>MODERATE</b>	<b>Phragmites</b>	<b>June–July</b>	<b>June–July</b>	Spreads mostly by rhizomes; seed viability <1%. Mow to reduce biomass before herbicide. Not effective alone.
<b>DO NOT MOW</b>	<b>Japanese Knotweed</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	Spreads by stem/rhizome fragments. Mowing creates new infestations. Flag and skip. Stem injection preferred.

## Species-Specific Guidance

### Wild Chervil (*Anthriscus sylvestris*)

Wild chervil is the highest-priority target for early mowing in Thetford. Central Vermont is considered a regional hotspot for this species. It blooms from May through June, with seeds ripening from June into July. Each plant can produce 800–10,000 seeds, though the seed bank is short-lived (1–2 years). It is a prolific roadside colonizer and is readily spread by mowing equipment after seed set.

**Timing:** Mow valley roads by late May, upland roads by early to mid-June—before flowers fully open. If white umbels are already visible but seeds have not turned brown, mowing is still beneficial.

**Repeat mowing:** Plants may resprout after a single cut. Ideally mow infested sections at least 3 times per season at the onset of flowering. Two to three years of consistent mowing can exhaust the seed bank.

**Equipment cleaning:** Critical after mowing chervil. Mowing after seed set is a primary dispersal vector for this species.

### **Wild (Poison) Parsnip (*Pastinaca sativa*)**

Wild parsnip is extremely common along Thetford roadsides. It flowers from late May through July, with the primary umbel producing viable seed by mid- to late July. The plant's sap causes phytophotodermatitis—severe burns when skin contact is combined with sunlight. Seeds can persist in the soil for 4–5 years.

**Timing:** Mow valley roads by mid- to late June, upland roads by late June to early July. The critical window is after flowering begins but before the primary umbel's seeds turn brown and dry.

**Caution on mow timing:** Research (Kline 1986) has shown that annual July mowing can actually increase parsnip density by suppressing competing goldenrod and other natives. If mowing too early (June), plants may resprout and still set seed. If too late (late July), the primary umbel may already have mature seeds. The window is narrow—field-check before mowing.

**PPE:** Operators must wear long sleeves, gloves, and eye protection. If using a string trimmer or brush saw, wear a face shield. Avoid mowing parsnip on hot, sunny days when sap exposure risk is highest.

### **Japanese Knotweed (*Reynoutria japonica*)**

Knotweed is fundamentally different from the other species on this list. It spreads primarily by vegetative fragments—pieces of stem or rhizome that break off and root at the nodes. In New England, Japanese knotweed typically produces only female flowers and generally cannot set viable seed unless giant or Bohemian knotweed is nearby as a pollen source.

**Do not mow.** Mowing with roadside equipment creates fragments that are carried on mower decks and in ditchlines to new locations. This is a well-documented dispersal pathway. Known patches should be GPS-marked, flagged with stakes, and excluded from routine mowing.

**Preferred treatment:** Stem injection of glyphosate after flowering (August–September) is the most selective and effective method. Cut-and-treat with foliar spray of regrowth is an alternative for larger stands. Multi-year commitment is required.

### **Phragmites (*Phragmites australis*)**

Invasive phragmites spreads primarily through its extensive rhizome network. Seed viability is very low in developed watersheds (less than 1% germination to maturity). It forms dense stands in roadside ditches, wet swales, and drainage features.

**Mowing role:** Mowing alone will not control phragmites, but a June–July cut can reduce biomass, improve access for later herbicide treatment, and reduce seed production. Do not mow within one month before or after herbicide application—the plant needs leaf area to translocate herbicide to the roots.

**Equipment:** Clean all equipment of stem fragments after mowing phragmites. Fragments can root and establish new colonies.

### Woody Shrubs: Honeysuckle, Buckthorn, and Burning Bush

Bush honeysuckle (*Lonicera* spp.), glossy buckthorn (*Frangula alnus*), common buckthorn (*Rhamnus cathartica*), and burning bush (*Euonymus alatus*) are woody shrubs that spread primarily by bird-dispersed fruit. Roadside mowing can suppress seedlings and prevent establishment in the right-of-way, but mowing alone will not control established plants—they resprout vigorously from the root crown.

**Glossy buckthorn** fruits earliest (July–August) and is the most aggressive invader of wet roadside areas. It can have flowers, unripe fruit, and ripe fruit on the same plant simultaneously.

**Common buckthorn** fruits August–September. Seeds remain viable in soil for 5+ years. Both buckthorn species retain leaves late into fall, making them easy to identify for targeted treatment.

**Bush honeysuckle** fruits September–October. Leaves out early and drops leaves late, offering a good late-season treatment window. Shallow-rooted—seedlings and small plants pull easily when soil is moist.

**Burning bush** fruits September–October. Less aggressive than the others but shade-tolerant and persistent. Fruit is conspicuous red, readily eaten by birds.

**Mowing guidance:** Routine mowing keeps seedlings from establishing in the ROW. For established shrubs, flag for cut-stump herbicide treatment during late fall when natives are dormant and these species are still identifiable by their retained green foliage.

### Recommended Seasonal Calendar

Period	Valley Roads	Upland Roads	Action / Notes
<b>Late May</b>	First mow pass	—	Target wild chervil in valley before bloom. Scout parsnip rosettes.
<b>Early–Mid June</b>	Second pass (chervil regrowth + early parsnip)	First pass (chervil at peak)	Valley parsnip approaching bloom. Upland chervil at peak. PPE for parsnip.
<b>Late June–Early July</b>	Parsnip critical window	Parsnip + chervil regrowth	Field-check parsnip umbels. Mow only if seeds still green. Clean equipment between sections.
<b>Mid–Late July</b>	Phragmites biomass cut (if applicable)	Phragmites biomass cut	Optional biomass reduction before late-summer herbicide. Do NOT mow knotweed.
<b>August</b>	General maintenance mow	General maintenance mow	Standard safety/visibility mowing. Avoid sections with ripe buckthorn fruit if practical.
<b>Late Oct–Nov</b>	Woody invasive ID + treatment	Woody invasive ID + treatment	Honeysuckle and buckthorn still green while natives dormant. Ideal for cut-stump herbicide.

## Equipment Cleaning Protocol

- Inspect and clean mower decks, undercarriages, and ditching attachments before moving between road sections with different invasive species infestations.
- Use compressed air, a leaf blower, or pressure washer to remove plant debris from mower housings, guards, and wheel wells.
- Pay particular attention after mowing wild chervil or wild parsnip that may have begun seeding—seeds are small and easily lodged in equipment.
- After mowing phragmites or passing near knotweed, inspect for stem fragments on the mower deck or in ditchline spoils.
- Log cleaning events with date and location for the town’s records.

## Worker Safety: Wild Parsnip

Wild parsnip sap contains furanocoumarins that cause severe burns (phytophotodermatitis) when skin contact is combined with UV exposure. The reaction can produce blisters, discoloration, and pain lasting weeks. Furanocoumarin concentrations can increase in plants that have been previously cut and allowed to regrow.

- Wear long pants, long-sleeved shirt, gloves, and eye protection when mowing areas with wild parsnip.
- If using a string trimmer or brush saw near parsnip, wear a face shield.
- If sap contacts skin, wash immediately with soap and cold water and keep the area out of sunlight for at least 48 hours.
- If blisters or rash develop, contact a healthcare provider.

## Limitations of Mowing

Roadside mowing is a maintenance activity, not an eradication strategy. This BMP is designed to reduce seed dispersal and avoid making existing infestations worse. Effective long-term control requires integrated management—targeted herbicide application, repeated mechanical treatment over multiple years, and restoration of competitive native vegetation. The town should consider working with an invasive vegetation control specialist for site-specific management plans on high-priority infestations.

## References and Resources

- **Vermont Invasives:** [vtinvasives.org](http://vtinvasives.org) — species profiles and treatment guidance
- **Vermont Dept. of Health:** Wild parsnip safety advisory and first aid guidance
- **UNH Extension:** Invasive species identification and control factsheets
- **NH Dept. of Agriculture:** Japanese knotweed best management practices guide
- **Great Lakes Phragmites Collaborative:** [greatlakesphragmites.net](http://greatlakesphragmites.net) — management techniques for common reed

- **Kline, V.M. 1986.** Response of wild parsnip to mowing. *Natural Areas Journal* 6(4).

# Town of Thetford

## Human Rights Equipment Procurement Policy

### Purpose

This policy was developed as a response to the Apartheid Free Communities Pledge, passed at the 2025 Thetford Town Meeting. Its purpose is part of a larger effort to further the Town of Thetford's commitment to a high level of fiscal, social, and environmental responsibility, and to define the process for procuring high value capital equipment products in a responsible manner. The Town of Thetford will prioritize vehicles and equipment that have a relatively lower negative societal impact.

### Policy Organization

This policy interacts with and enhances the Town of Thetford Purchasing Policy. It does not exempt any purchase from meeting all the relevant requirements of the Town of Thetford Procurement Policy.

Any purchase of new capital equipment over \$350,000 should be considered through the framework created in this policy. Purchases that do not entirely consist of Town funds may or may not follow the additional requirements of this policy.

This policy provides a framework to utilize when making purchasing decisions, helping to ensure that the purchases the Town makes are in line with its stated goals and objectives related to human rights. The Policy outlines procedures that ensure that the Town utilizes its resources to best meet the Town's operational needs.

Nothing in this policy shall be construed as requiring a department, vendor or contractor to procure goods or services that do not perform adequately for their intended use or are not available at a reasonable price or in a reasonable period of time. Decisions regarding adequacy or suitability for use shall be at the discretion of the Selectboard.

### Definitions

*"Emergency Purchase/Repair/Replacement"* is defined as a purchase, repair, or replacement for which immediate action is needed to avoid harm to Town property or personnel, and/or would substantially impact the Town's ability to provide adequate services. The Town Manager shall have full discretion to determine what constitutes an Emergency, and whether, in light of the emergency situation, the procedures defined in this Policy should apply as defined or in an amended form.

*“Large Capital Equipment”* is defined as new durable equipment valued at \$350,000 or more, purchased for use by town employees.

## **Procedure**

### **Large Capital Equipment**

For Large Capital Equipment purchases, as defined in this Policy, a review by the Town Manager and a Selectboard designee is required.

#### **1. Determine Scope**

Once a relevant purchase is deemed necessary, the process starts as defined by the Town of Thetford Purchasing Policy. If a sealed bid is required: every received bid will be subject to assessment. If a sealed bid is not required: at least two qualified vendors capable of providing the relevant products will be selected and shared with the Selectboard designee. If the purchase is being made from a single source, then that vendor will be assessed.

#### **2. Human Rights Assessment**

The Town Manager and Selectboard designee will review the vendors and manufacturers using the American Friends Service Committee database (<https://investigate.info>), and other databases as deemed necessary.

#### **3. Report**

The Town Manager and Selectboard designee will write a report of their findings and purchase recommendation to the Selectboard.

#### **4. Decision**

The Selectboard will make the final purchasing decision using the report in addition to the relevant Purchasing Policy requirements.

## **Exception**

The following exception may apply. However, there must be written documentation created and maintained that outlines the process and rationale for such an exception.

### **Emergency Purchases.**

The Selectboard or their designee may make purchases for the purpose of meeting the public emergency without complying with the purchasing process. Emergency purchases may include immediate repair or replacement of town vehicles or equipment if the delay in

such a repair or replacement would endanger persons or property or result in substantial impairment of the delivery of Town services.

Adopted this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_.

---

---

---

---

---



# Town of Thetford Vermont

3910 Vermont Route 113 • P.O. Box 126 • Thetford Center, VT 05075  
802-785-2922 • [www.thetfordvt.gov](http://www.thetfordvt.gov)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

**Selectboard Regular Meeting \*Draft\* Minutes**  
**Thetford Town Offices**  
**3910 Route 113**  
**(w/Virtual Attendance Option)**  
**Monday, April 6, 2026 7:00 PM**

Selectboard Members present: Chair Sharon Harkay, Vice-Chair David Goodrich, David Forbes, Li Shen, Steve Tofel  
Others present: Town Manager Brian Story  
Participating Community Members: Sherry Merrick, Cynthia Shelton, Duncan Nichols, Henry Nichols, Didi Pershouse, Dean Whitlock

Sharon Harkay called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

**221. Agenda Review**

No changes to the agenda.

**242. Notes from the Selectboard Chair**

Sharon informed the Selectboard that at the April 20<sup>th</sup> meeting the Capacity Study Steering Committee and the representatives from Dubois and King would be present.

The Upper Valley Fish and Game Club lease will be discussed at the May 4<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**283. Town Manager Report**

1. Green Up Day – Sign ups are open and the Conservation Commission will have a table at the transfer station for the next few weeks.
2. Comments for Capacity Study – everyone who has comments or questions will be able to ask them at the meeting, but advance submissions will close tomorrow.
3. A driveway permit was issued on Quinibeck Road for a parcel without current address, near the corner with Dennison Lane.

**374. Committee and Commission Reports**

Steve Tofel said Cemetery Commission has verbally agreed with TCCT (*Thetford Center Community Trust*) on the boundary and right of way into the Evergreen Rest Cemetery.

Li reported that Alicia Houk is not going to continue with the Conservation Commission.

1  
2  
3

**45. Public Comment**

5 Sherry Merrick mentioned the 250<sup>th</sup> free event on Saturday at the Martha Rich Theater. It  
6 is a screening of We The People’s production of *1776*. Sherry said there is information on  
7 their website. Their monthly meeting will be on Sunday at 6:00 PM at Town Hall and  
8 anyone is welcome to come.

9 Cynthia Shelton requested that the vacant Health Officer job be put on the listserv with a  
10 good job description.

11 Sherry Merrick also said that on May 2, Dave Briggs will be talking about the history of  
12 Thetford across the street at Thetford Center Community Building. There will be a potluck  
13 at 5:00.

**146. Discussion of the Addendum to the Town Purchasing Policy Regarding Consideration  
15 of Human Rights**

16 Brian had made edits to the document for the Selectboard to review. After discussion, a  
17 motion was made by David Goodrich that under the exemptions we have a statement that  
18 this policy does not apply to the purchase of used equipment purchased from the vendor  
19 that doesn’t benefit the original manufacturer. Brian suggested that it might be better to  
20 handle that in the setup, where it talks about what qualifies, rather than as an exemption.  
21 With no other discussion Sharon called for a vote. Motion passes with all in favor.

**227. Discussion of Securing Liability Insurance for the June SQC (Semi-Quincentennial)  
23 Event**

24 Motion by Sharon Harkay that the Selectboard should ask the existing SQC volunteers to  
25 continue planning and put the event on the Thetford Center Town Green on June 20<sup>th</sup> to  
26 make sure it happens for the town. And that the town will therefore cover their insurance  
27 with the town’s insurance. The motion passed unanimously.

**288. Appointments to Town Committees, Commissions and Other Positions**

29 Motion by Sharon Harkay that we reappoint Matt Parno for a 4-year term on the  
30 Conservation Commission ending in 2030. Motion passed unanimously.

31 Motion by Sharon Harkay that we reappoint Sue Howard and Bill Bridge for 3-year terms  
32 on the Development Review Board, ending in 2029. Motion passed unanimously.

33 Motion by Sharon Harkay that Mariah Whitcomb is willing to continue serving for another  
34 year, so that term would end in 2027. Motion passed unanimously.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

Motion by Sharon Harkay that we reappoint Chuck Cole and Alice Steward to another 3-year term, each on the Thetford Energy Committee, ending in 2029. Motion passed unanimously.

Motion by Sharon Harkay that we reappoint Stephen Branchflower for another 3-year term on the Historic Preservation Committee. Motion passed unanimously.

Motion by Sharon Harkay that we reappoint Liz Ryan Cole for another 3-year term on the Planning Commission, ending in 2029. Motion passed unanimously.

Sharon explained that she had received an email from the current chair of the Treasure Island Committee suggesting that the committee be disbanded or dissolved. Sharon reached out to other committees for their thoughts, and it was suggested that there is redundancy with the Treasure Island Committee and the Recreation Council. There is also concern that the stewardship plan continues and perhaps the Conservation Commission could take that on. Sharon made a motion that we dissolve the Treasure Island Committee for the time being. The motion passed unanimously.

There was discussion on how to distribute the work of the Treasure Island Committee between the Rec Advisory Council and the Conservation Commission.

Motion by Sharon Harkay that we will rename the Recreation Advisory Council to the Parks and Recreation Council, aka PARC, which will inform and assist our Recreation Director with her mandates, and that it will continue to be a 3-year term. Motion passed unanimously.

There was discussion about if the charge would change and why it is a council and not a committee or commission.

Sharon then changed her motion to say that she makes a motion that we rename the Recreation Advisory Council to Parks and Recreation Committee with members having 3-year terms. Motion passed unanimously.

Sharon Harkay made a motion that we reappoint Charlotte Rutledge (to PARC) for a 2-year term ending in 2028, that we newly appoint Amy Duchette for a 2-year term this time ending in 2028, that we newly appoint Tori Barker, Keisha Covey and Chris Leitao for a 3-year term ending in 2029, and thereafter everybody will have 3-year terms. Motion passed unanimously.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

Motion by Sharon Harkay that we reappoint Pippa Drew and newly appoint both Dave Joyce and Matthew Lyons all for 3-year terms on the Thetford Housing Committee with terms ending in 2029. Motion passed unanimously.

Motion by Sharon Harkay that we reappoint Pat Pisano and Sue Gault for 1-year terms ending in 2027 and newly appoint Mary Raines to a 3-year term ending in 2029 for the Thetford Elder Network. Motion passed unanimously.

Motion by Sharon Harkay that we reappoint Chief Scruggs and Town Manger Brian Story to the Thetford Restorative Justice Council for 3-year terms. Motion passed unanimously.

There was discussion about why this was named Council instead of Committee. Sharon said to correct her motion to call it Thetford Restorative Justice Steering Committee.

Motion by Sharon Harkay that we should reappoint Jessica Eaton for a 1-year term for Town Service Officer ending in 2027. Motion passed unanimously.

Motion by Sharon Harkay to reappoint Don Downey for another 1-year term as our Tree Warden ending in 2027. Motion passed unanimously.

Motion by Sharon Harkay that we reappoint Jessica Eaton for another 3-year term on the Tri-Town Commission ending in 2029. Motion passed unanimously.

Motion by Sharon Harkay that we reappoint Tim Taylor as our rep to the TROC (*Two Rivers-Ottawaquechee Regional Planning Commission*) board with a 3-year term this time, ending in 2029. Motion passed unanimously.

Motion by Sharon Harkay that we reappoint Brian Story to the Transportation Advisory Committee for a 3-year term ending in 2029. Motion passed unanimously.

Motion by Sharon Harkay that we reappoint David Goodrich to be our representative with the Upper Valley Ambulance for a 3-year term ending in 2029. Motion passed unanimously.

**279. Adoption of Vermont Road and Bridge Standards**

After discussion, David Goodrich made a motion that we accept the new Town Road and Bridge Standards as Brian presented them tonight. Motion passed unanimously.

**3010. Approval of 2027 Grants in Aid Letter of Intent**

Motion by David Forbes to accept a letter of intent to participate in the fiscal year 27 Municipal Roads Grants Management Program as presented, and to appoint Brian Story as a duly authorized representative. Motion passed unanimously.

1  
2  
3

**411. Warrants**

12.1	\$23384.74
13.1	\$51498.97
14.1	\$45336.05
7.3	\$1471.86
6.4	\$33288.83
7.4	\$35091.66

5

6 Motion by Li Shen to accept the warrants as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

**712. Minutes**

8 Motion by Steve Tofel to accept the meeting minutes of March 16<sup>th</sup> as amended. Motion  
9 passed unanimously.

10 Motion by Sharon Harkay to approve the short version of the minutes of Monday, February  
11 23<sup>rd</sup>, as further edited. Motion passed unanimously.

**1213. Adjourn**

13 Motion by Steve Tofel to adjourn the meeting at 9:14 PM. Motion passed unanimously.

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20